

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/914,771	09/04/2001	Erik Jensen	JENSEN=7	4127
1444	7590 02/06/2004		EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW			SMITH, DUANE	
SUITE 300	IREEI, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			1724	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	09/914,771	JENSEN, ERIK	$\bigcirc$			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Duane S. Smith	1724				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sh	neet with the correspondence a	iddress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and if NO period for reply sis specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by second and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however n. a reply within the statutory minimu briod will apply and will expire SIX tatute, cause the application to be	r, may a reply be timely filed arm of thirty (30) days will be considered tim (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u>2-08-03</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ 1	his action is non-final.	•				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 14-41 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 39 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 14-23 and 34-40 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 24 and 35 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers			•			
	nin o r					
9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10)  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12)   Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)   All b)   Some * c)   None of:  1.						
Attachment(s)	,					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.	5) 🔲 Not	erview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No lice of Informal Patent Application (PT ler:				

The Final Office Action mailed 1-14-03 is hereby withdrawn and vacated. A new office action follows:

- 1. In claim 27, "i.e. defined..." should be amended to be positive recitation or deleted. For examination purposes the phrase has not been given any patentable weight.
- 2. In claim 27 last line "5" should be deleted.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 14-15,18,21,25,40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German patent 1054421 taken together with WO91/01784.

German patent 1054421 teaches an apparatus for rectification of a liquid or scrubbing of a gas including horizontal elongated processing chamber (10) divided by a plurality of guide plates(12,13) extending across a major part of the cross section of the processing chamber, means for supplying liquid(15,30), means for discharging liquid(18), means for supplying gas(11), means for discharging gas(14), liquid application means(16) extending along a major part of the chamber length for throwing water transversely to the longitudinal axis of the processing chamber. German patent 1054421 discloses the apparatus essentially as claimed except for the liquid application means to be a rotor having liquid collecting pockets in the direction of rotation. However, WO91/01784 does disclose such liquid application means(10). It would have been

Application/Control Number: 09/914,771

Art Unit: 1724

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the liquid application means of WO91/01784 for the liquid application means of the German reference in that mere substitution of one known functional equivalent liquid application means for another being well within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art and there has been no showing of unexpected or unobvious results of utilizing one known liquid application means over another.

With regards to claims 18, the gas flow follows a transverse tortuous path, see gas flow path arrows of figure 1. With regards to claim 25, the German reference teaches a conveyor means (21).

5. Claim 16-17,19-20,22,23,27-34,36,38,41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German patent 1054421 taken together with WO91/01784 as applied to claims in paragraph above in view of Laycock et al(US Patent No. 282,994).

German patent 1054421 taken together with WO91/01784 teaches the apparatus essentially as claimed except for disclose a removable end wall releasable fastened by bolts to flanges for allowing insertion of guide plates into a processing chamber wherein the guide plates are releasable fastened into various predetermined axial spaced positions. However, Laycock et al disclose a removable end wall(M) releasable fastened by bolts to flanges(K) for allowing insertion of guide plates(B) into a processing chamber wherein the guide plates are releasable fastened(E, E') into various predetermined axial spaced positions( page 2, col. 1 or col. 3 of the entire document, lines 28-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a removable end wall and guide plates in the apparatus of the

Application/Control Number: 09/914,771

Art Unit: 1724

German patent in order to configure the interconnected section in order to obtain the desired efficiency as suggested by Laycock et al.(col. 3 lines 31-32).

With regards to claim 22, German patent discloses a liquid receiving chamber (19).

6. Claims 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German patent 1054421 taken together with Gale(US Patent No. 3,353,337)

German patent 1054421 disclose the apparatus essentially as claimed except for the conveyor means being a screw conveyor. However, Gale does disclose a screw conveyor(30,47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute a screw conveyor for the conveyor means of the German reference in order to remove accumulated solids by the same shaft that rotates the liquid application means as suggested by Gale(col. 3 lines 35-40) and thus save upon energy requirements.

7. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over German patent 1054421 taken together with WO91/01784 in view of Laycock et al. as applied to claims above, and further in view of Gale(US Patent No. 3,353,337)

German patent 1054421taken together with WO91/01784 in view of Laycock disclose the apparatus essentially as claimed except for the conveyor means being a screw conveyor. However, Gale does disclose a screw conveyor(30,47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute a screw conveyor for the conveyor means of the German reference in order to remove

Application/Control Number: 09/914,771

Art Unit: 1724

accumulated solids by the same shaft that rotates the liquid application means as suggested by Gale(col. 3 lines 35-40) and thus save upon energy requirements.

- 8. Claim 24,35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. Claim 39 is allowed over the prior art of record.
- 10. Applicant's arguments filed 12-08-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant is silent to the 103(a) rejection under the German reference taken together with the WO91/01784 reference. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant further argues that Laycock et al fails to disclose a removable member as in the instant invention. Laycock et al was only cited to show a removable member (M) is well known in the art for access to a processing chamber. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this case the inclusion of a removable member for

Art Unit: 1724

access to the process chamber. All other arguments have been considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duane S. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-1166. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-TH.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on 571-272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-0987.

Duane S. Smith Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1724

Dss 1-23-04